

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 were pending and claims 1-5 stand rejected. By virtue of this response, claim 1 has been amended. The amendment and new claims are fully supported by the application as filed and no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are currently under consideration. Amendment or cancellation of subject matter is not to be construed as an abandonment of any subject matter.

As a preliminarily matter, Applicants thank Examiner Craig Renner for discussing the present application by telephone on October 17, 2007. No exhibits were presented. The subject matter of the present application and the previously cited prior were discussed. Possible claim amendments to claim 1 to overcome the prior art of record were also discussed.

#### **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to as allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include on or more reference signs not mentioned in the description.

In response, paragraph [0028] is amended to include a description of "D1" shown in FIGS. 4A, 5A, 6A, and 7A.

#### **Specification**

The disclosure is objected to because of an alleged informality.

In response, paragraph [0017] has been amended to correspond to FIG. 1.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102(b)**

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ozawa (U.S. No. 5,067,036, hereinafter "Ozawa").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things, “a media flag movably coupled to the receiver and translatable from a first position to a second position, such that, at any instant, all points of the media flag move at the same velocity and direction of motion as every other point of the media flag, in response to inserting the storage media device into the receiver” (emphasis added). For support, see paragraphs [0017]-[0019] and [0039], for example.

Therefore, in other words, the “media flag” moves without rotation or angular displacement.

In contrast, Ozawa discloses a “sensor arm 31,” that is rotated in response to a cassette being inserted into a tape drive. The “sensor arm” merely moves to block a photo sensor and detects whether a cassette, not discriminating between a large type or small type, is placed in the cassette holder, described as follows:

When the large cassette 1 or the small cassette 2 is inserted into the cassette holder 4, the front surface of the large cassette 1 or the small cassette 2 pushes the cylindrical projection portion 31a before the front end surface of the large cassette 1 or the small cassette 2 comes contact with the projection 3b of the tray 3. As a result, the sensor arm 31 is rotated counterclockwise relative to the shaft 32, causing the photo-sensor to be brought into the light shielded state. Thus, a fact that the large cassette 1 or the small cassette 2 has been placed in the cassette holder 4 can be detected, causing the motor 36 to be driven in the direction of the arrow A. (Emphasis added). (Col. 5, lines 9-21).

Therefore, Ozawa does not disclose or suggest “a media flag movably coupled to the receiver and translatable from a first position to a second position, such that, at any instant, all points of the media flag move at the same velocity and direction of motion as every other point of the media flag, in response to inserting the storage media device into the receiver,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable over Ozawa.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit claims 2-3 and 5, each of which is dependent on independent claim 1, are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)**

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ozawa.

Claim 4 depends upon base claim 1, and is allowable over Ozawa for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 4.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claim 6-9 contain allowable subject matter. However, claims 6-9 are objected to as allegedly being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicates claims 6-9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

However, in response, Applicants respectfully submit such an amendment is not necessary in light of the reasons given in this document.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing **Docket No. 249212026300**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Denise H. Wong  
Registration No.: 59,622  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
(415) 268-6221